

## ATTACHMENT A Remarks

Before considering the rejections on prior art, it is noted that minor amendments have been made to claims 10 and 14 in order to make it clear that the input signal presented to the presentation device is the modified input signal and, in the case of claim 14, to provide a more consistent antecedent basis for the phrase "said modified one signal." These changes do not change the scope of the claims nor impact on the patentability of the claims.

Claims 10-22 and 28-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (US Patent No. 5,945,988) in view of Morrison et al (US Patent No. 6,253,502). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As was pointed out in the last response, independent claim 10 recites a "computer-readable medium containing computer instructions and data for carrying out the operations of: ...selecting one of said media input signals for presentation." It is respectfully submitted that this language patentably distinguishes over the Williams et al patent. In the latter, a user performs the selection while the remote control merely communicates the user selection. In contrast, in claim 10, the claimed "selecting" operation is performed by a method embodied on a computer-readable medium.

Further, claim 10 recites "transmitting said modified one media input signal to said presentation device." It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not disclosed in the Williams et al patent wherein the media input signal is modified after it is transmitted to the presentation device. As set forth in the previous response, the reference provides that "input signals, (e.g., channel/select and changes, volume changes...) are input to system 100 via system controller 104, which in turn forwards control signals to the appropriate components to perform the desired function" (emphasis added) (see column 7, line 65-67 and column 8, lines 1-2).

Although the Office Action does not comment on the first distinction discussed above, the Office Action acknowledges that the reference "only discloses sending control signal to manually adjust the television and fails to specifically disclose that the modified signal is transmitted to the presentation device."

The Examiner relies on the Morrison et al patent as rendering this distinction obvious. In particular, it is stated that "Morrison discloses a television receiver that receives and RF input and external video and audio input (see elements 100 and VIDEO IN and AUDIO IN (Figure.

3)), which transmits the video signal to a switch, which transmits either RF or external video output to a presentation device 158 in Figure 3 (emphasis in the original). The Examiner also noted that Morrison discloses a database similar to Williams database 700 in Figure 2, and that this database dictates what settings will be adjusted by circuits 155 and 135 in Figure 3, and later transmitted to the presentation device” (emphasis in the original).

The Morrison et al patent relates to an autopilot feature that “operates television systems as shown in FIG. 3 having electronic program guides (EPGs)” (see column 2, lines 48-50). The database in FIG. 2 shows “differing settings for various types of programming,” (see column 3, lines 18-20). Thus, as explained in column 3, the autopilot system will set audio and video settings based on the character of the program in the EPG database so that the settings will be different for an ice hockey game versus a comic movie. These settings are determined by scanning the EPG database and matching the topic and theme with the preset list stored in memory. It is respectfully submitted that this teaching of the reference clearly has nothing to do with “associating each of a plurality of setting values for a presentation device with each of a plurality of media input signals in a multimedia system,” as claimed in claim 10. The Morrison et al system is strictly concerned with changing settings based on program content as determined by scanning an EPG.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action mischaracterizes the function of switch 137. Video switch 137 is part of the closed caption circuitry of the television receiver in the Morrison et al patent. As stated in the first full paragraph, of column 5 of the reference, “[a] Data Slicer 145 receives closed-caption data at a first input from VIF/SIF amplifier and detector unit 130 and at a second input from the VIDEO IN terminal via a Video Switch 137 which seeks the proper source of closed-caption data under control of controller 110.” It is respectfully submitted that this operation of switch 137 has nothing to do with the present invention as claimed in claim 10, and that, moreover, switch 137 has nothing to do with the database of FIG. 2 of the reference. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that given the actual teaching of the Morrison et al patent, no fair combination of these teachings with those of the primary reference could possibly result in the present invention as claimed in claim 10.

Independent claim 14 is similar to claim 10 and distinguishes over the cited references for basically the same reasons as discussed above.

Independent claim 28 recites, "a switch for transmitting a selected one of a plurality of media signals to said output device in response to said selection commands." Independent claim 14 includes as similar recitation and the Examiner has referred to the rejection of claim 40 in rejecting claim 28. In rejecting claim 40, the Examiner contends that the Morrison et al patent "discloses as switch coupled to the media devices and presentation device for transmitting a selected one of the media signals to the presentation device in response to the selection command (see element 37 in Figure 3 and Column 5, Lines 4-8 for Video Switch selection the proper video input)."

As discussed above, it is respectfully submitted switch 137 of the Morrison patent is not coupled to a plurality of media devices and a presentation device for transmitting a selected one of the media signals to the presentation device but rather performs an entirely different function as part of the closed-caption circuitry of the television receiver of the reference. The Examiner has concluded that "[a]t the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the bus, as taught by Williams using the video switch, as taught by Morrison, for the purpose of eliminating possible conflicts and bandwidth congestion which may occur over a bus architecture, by using the switch, which routes one signal at a time." It is respectfully submitted that it is clear that this conclusion in no way follows from the actual teachings of the Morrison et al reference which, as discussed above, relates to entirely different problems, and certainly is not concerned with eliminating possible conflicts and bandwidth congestion which may occur over a bus architecture. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28 and 40 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

With respect to independent claims 41 and 42, these claims include recitations similar to those of claims 28 and 40 and are patentable for basically the same reasons.

The dependent claims are, of course, patentably for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of the claims parent thereto.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

**End Remarks**